



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,571	06/03/2005	Hoi Young Chan	YOR92002020GUS1 (8728-587)	4559
46/69 7590 05/23/2008 F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC 130 WOODBURY ROAD WOODBURY, NY 11797				
EXAMINER BROWN JR, NATHAN II				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2129				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/23/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/537,571

Applicant(s)

CHAN ET AL.

Examiner

NATHAN H. BROWN JR

Art Unit

2129

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-10, 13, 16-18, 20 and 36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-10, 13, 16-18, 20 and 36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ ~~Notice of Informal Patent Application~~
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Examiner's Detailed Office Action

1. This Office Action is responsive to the communication for application 10/537,571, filed February 19, 2008.
2. Claims 1, 3-10, 13, 16-18, 20, and 36 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, and 36 are currently amended. Claims 2, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, and 21-35 are cancelled. Claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 16-18, and 20 are previously presented. Claim 8 is original.
3. After the previous office action, claims 1, 3-10, 13, 16-18, 20, and 36 stood rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The claims fail to provide a tangible result, and there must be a practical application, by either:

- 1) transforming (physical thing) or
- 2) by having the FINAL RESULT (not the steps) achieve or produce

a useful (specific, substantial, AND credible), concrete (substantially repeatable/non-unpredictable), AND tangible (real world/non-abstract) result.

A claim that is so broad that it reads on both statutory and non-statutory subject matter, must be amended. A claim that recites a computer that solely calculates a mathematical formula is not statutory.

Claims 1, 3-10, 13, 16-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not directed to a practical application and violates the doctrine of preemption. Amended independent claim 1 recites a "computer readable medium embodying a program of instructions executable by a processor to perform a method deriving knowledge from parameters and data" producing a final result of "outputting the knowledge derived by the inference to the program of instructions". The recited "knowledge" derived "from parameters and data" is considered to be a mathematical abstraction of logical reasoning. The method for "deriving knowledge from parameters and data" is considered to be an algorithm. The final result of "outputting the knowledge derived by the inference to the program of instructions" does not provide a specific and substantial result such as the final share price, momentarily fixed for recording and reporting, in *State Street*; as the knowledge recited does

not represent specific and substantial entities and relationships in a real-world problem domain.

Further, since knowledge derived from "parameters" and "data" can represent any conceivable thing or situation, claim 1 violates the doctrine of preemption by seeking patent protection for the application of the claimed method to every substantial application. Claims 3-10, 13, 16-18, and 20 merely provide further algorithmic limitation of claim 1, and thus do not cure the deficiency of claim 1. Therefore claims 1, 3-10, 13, 16-18, and 20 are considered non-statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101.

6. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not directed to a practical application and violates the doctrine of preemption. Amended independent claim 36 recites a system with a memory and processors for "executing a program of instructions in communication with an externalized inference component" producing a final result of "evaluating the data of an externalized inferencing component...and outputting the knowledge derived by the inference to the program of instructions". The final result is not considered to provide a specific and substantial result, such as the final share price,

momentarily fixed for recording and reporting, of *State Street*, as the claimed output knowledge does not represent specific and substantial real-world entities or relationships. Further, since knowledge derived from parameters and data can represent any conceivable thing or situation, claim 36 violates the doctrine of preemption by seeking patent protection for a device which applies the method of claim 1 to every substantial application. Claim 36 is therefore considered to be non-statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

8. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by **IBM**, "WebSphere Application Server Enterprise Services Business Rule Beans (BRBeans)", 2001.

Regarding claim 1. (Currently Amended) A computer readable medium (not further defined) embodying a program of instructions

Art Unit: 2129

executable by a processor to perform a method for deriving knowledge from parameters and data (see p. 8, §Getting Started with BRBeans, Examiner interprets steps 1 and 2 to install a program of instructions on a computer readable medium e.g., a disk drive, of an AE server to be embodying a program of instructions executable by a processor.), the method comprising:

passing the parameters (not further defined) to an externalized inferencing component upon executing a trigger point in the program of instructions (see pp. 26-27, §Situational Trigger Point - an example, code fragment, Examiner interprets: a classifier rule to be an externalized inferencing component (Business Rule Bean (see pp. 2-4)) the data of the externalized inferencing component to be the "Customer cust" object, "TriggerPoint tp" to be a trigger point, and "Object [] classifierPlist" to comprise parameters passed by a trigger point within the program of instructions to perform an inference, and "result = tp.triggerSituational(this, classifiedPlist, classifierPlist, classifiedRule, classifierRuleName)" to be the point where execution occurs.);

evaluating, by the externalized inferencing component, the data comprising a set of rules to be interpreted of an externalized inferencing component in the presence of against the parameters to perform an inference external to the program

of instructions passed by a trigger point within the program of instructions to perform an inference (see §The BRBeans framework - overview, BRBeans EJBs, p. 18 and §Runtime behavior, p. 32-33, Examiner interprets the "WebSphere application server in which the BRBeans EJBs are installed" to comprise relational databases in which all rule classes, entity classes, and trigger point classes are implemented in relational database tables. Thus any evaluation of data comprising a set of externalized inferencing rules against parameters to perform an inference are simply queries applied to the associated tables defined in WebSphere.), wherein the externalized inferencing component is in communication with the program of instructions (see p. 20, Examiner interprets the "Firing Location" parameters to govern how the externalized inferencing component is in communication with the program of instructions.), wherein the inference is a derivation of the knowledge (see p. 45, §Writing your own strategies, steps 1-3, Examiner interprets the "firing strategy fires the rules found by the finding strategy, possibly modified by the filtering strategy...gathers up the results of the individual rules and these results are passed to the combining strategy" to implement derivation of the knowledge through firing a rule (i.e., inferencing).);

storing the knowledge derived by the inference with the data (see §The BRBeans framework - overview, BRBeans EJBs, p. 18 and §Runtime behavior, p. 32-33, Examiner interprets the "WebSphere application server in which the BRBeans EJBs are installed" to comprise relational databases in which all rule classes, entity classes, and trigger point classes are implemented in relational database tables. Thus knowledge derived (e.g., business situation knowledge) is necessarily stored in the database along with the data giving rise to the situational inference.); and

outputting the knowledge derived by the inference to trigger point of the program of instructions (see p. 45, §Writing your own strategies, step 3, Examiner interprets passing the results of steps 1-3 "to the combining strategy" to be outputting the knowledge derived by the inference to the program of instructions "to produce the final result of the trigger").

Regarding claim 36. (Currently Amended) A system for executing a program of instructions in communication with an externalized inference component (see p. 2, Examiner interprets "Websphere" to be system for executing a program of instructions in

communication with an externalized inference component.)

comprising:

a memory device storing data, the program of instructions and the externalized inference component (see pp. 6-8, Examiner interprets a "relational databases...supported by BRBeans" to be memory devices storing data.);

a processor for receiving the data and executing the plurality of instructions and the externalized inference component to perform a method for deriving knowledge from the data (see p. 47, "If these are not specified, then the name server used by the container in which the application is running is used. If the application is not running in a container, then localhost is used for the host name, and 900 is used for the port number.", Examiner interprets the "name server" or the "localhost" to be computers comprising a processor for receiving the data and executing the plurality of instructions and the externalized inference component to perform a method for deriving knowledge from the data.) comprising:

passing the parameters to an externalized inferencing component upon executing a trigger point in the program of instructions (see pp. 26-27, \$Situational Trigger Point - an example, code fragment, Examiner interprets: a classifier rule to be an externalized inferencing component

(Buisness Rule Bean (see pp. 2-4)) the data of the externalized inferencing component to be the "Customer cust" object, "TriggerPoint tp" to be a trigger point, and "Object [] classifierPlist" to comprise parameters passed by a trigger point within the program of instructions to perform an inference, and "result = tp.triggerSituational(this, classifiedPlist, classifierPlist, classifiedRule,classifierRuleName)" to be the point where execution occurs.);

evaluating, by the externalized inferencing component, the data comprising a set of rules to be interpreted of an externalized inferencing component in the presence of against the parameters to perform an inference external to the program of instructions passed by a trigger point within the program of instructions to perform an inference (see), wherein the externalized inferencing component is in communication with the program of instructions (see p. 20, Examiner interprets the "Firing Location" parameters to govern how the externalized inferencing component is in communication with the program of instructions.), wherein the inference is a derivation of the knowledge (see p. 45, \$Writing your own strategies, steps 1-3, Examiner interprets the "firing strategy fires the rules found by

the finding strategy, possibly modified by the filtering strategy...gathers up the results of the individual rules and these results are passed to the combining strategy" to implement derivation of the knowledge through firing a rule (i.e., inferencing).);

storing the knowledge derived by the inference with the data (see §The BRBeans framework - overview, BRBeans EJBs, p. 18 and §Runtime behavior, p. 32-33, Examiner interprets the "WebSphere application server in which the BRBeans EJBs are installed" to comprise relational databases in which all rule classes, entity classes, and trigger point classes are implemented in relational database tables. Thus knowledge derived (e.g., business situation knowledge) is necessarily stored in the database along with the data giving rise to the situational inference.); and

outputting the knowledge derived by the inference to trigger point of the program of instructions (see p. 45, §Writing your own strategies, step 3, Examiner interprets passing the results of steps 1-3 "to the combining strategy" to be outputting the knowledge derived by the inference to the program of

instructions "to produce the final result of the trigger").

Regarding claim 3. (Currently Amended) *IBM* teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the data is stored in persistent memory external to the program of instructions (see pp. 6-8, *\$Database considerations, Examiner interpret DB2, Oracle, Sybase, and Informix to store data in persistent memory external to the program of instructions.*).

Regarding claim 4. (Currently Amended) *IBM* teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the externalized inferencing component includes at least one of a short term fact, an inference rule, an inference engine, a static variable mapping, a sensor, an effector, a long term fact, and a conclusion (see pp. 22-29, *\$Trigger Point Framework - overview*).

Regarding claim 5. (Currently Amended) *IBM* teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the externalized inferencing component includes at least one of a short term fact component, an inference rule set component, an inference engine component, a static mapping component, a sensor component, an effector component, a long

term fact component, and a conclusion component (see p. 22, §Trigger Point Framework - overview, *Examiner interprets "the BRBeans trigger point" to be part of the BRBeans externalized inferencing component set.*).

Regarding claim 6. (Previously Presented) *IBM* teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the externalized inferencing component is one of a consumer of data provided by an inferencing component, a supplier of data provided by an inferencing component, and a combination thereof (see pp. 26-27, §Situational Trigger Point - an example, code fragment, *Examiner interprets: the externalized inferencing component to be the "Customer cust" object to be one of a consumer of data provided by an inferencing component.*).

Regarding claim 7. (Previously Presented) *IBM* teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of associating the trigger point with the program of instructions (see pp. 26-27, §Situational Trigger Point - an example, code fragment, *Examiner interprets the method name called to associate the trigger point with the program of instructions, e.g., setCombiningStrategy in tp.setCombiningStrategy.*).

Regarding claim 8. (Original) *IBM* teaches the method of claim 4, wherein trigger points operate either synchronously or asynchronously (see p. 47, *§As Of date, Examiner interprets "in effect" to allow trigger points to fire rules synchronously and the setAsOfDate method on the TriggerPoint object to to allow trigger points to fire rules asynchronously.*).

Regarding claim 9. (Previously Presented) *IBM* teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the externalized inferencing component is a master inferencing component that employs at least one other externalized inferencing component (see pp. 26-27, *§Situational Trigger Point - an example, code fragment, Examiner interprets: "TriggerPoint tp" to be a master inferencing component that employs at least one other externalized inferencing component, a classifier rule (Buisness Rule Bean (see pp. 2-4)).*).

Regarding claim 10. (Previously Presented) *IBM* teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the externalized inferencing component employs an inferencing engine (see p. 45-46, *§Writing your own strategies, Examiner considers the TriggerPoint strategies (FindingStrategy, FilteringStrategy, FiringStrategy, and CombiningStrategy) to comprise an inferencing engine as they control rule firing.*).

Regarding claim 13. (Previously Presented) *IBM* teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the externalized inferencing component is composed of at least one inferencing subcomponent (see pp. 45-46, §Writing your own strategies, *Examiner interprets: "TriggerPoint tp" to be an inferencing component composed inferencing subcomponents, TriggerPoint strategies classes (FindingStrategy, FilteringStrategy, FiringStrategy, and CombiningStrategy).*).

Regarding claim 16. (Previously Presented) *IBM* teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising sharing the externalized inferencing component by reference with at least one other externalized inferencing component (see p. 47, §The BRBeans Properties file, "When an application attempts to reference BRBeans EJBs, the code will first look for the brbPropertiesFile Java property. If this property is specified, then the names listed in that file are used to find the EJBs, overriding any EJB references that were specified in the container (if the application is running in a container). If the property is not specified, then

BRBeans attempts to use the EJB references specified in the container.").

Regarding claim 17. (Previously Presented) *IBM* teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the externalized inferencing component performs method steps to one of create, update and delete another externalized inferencing component (see p. 34, §Rule Management APIs, IRule, "This is the interface used to access the object representing a business rule in BRBeans. It provides methods to read and update attributes of the rule, to delete the rule, and to make a copy of the rule. The methods to create rules are on the IRuleFolder interface since you must always create a rule into a particular folder.", *Examiner interprets the "com.ibm.websphere.brb.mgmt package" to comprise externalized inferencing components.*).

Regarding claim 18. (Previously Presented) *IBM* teaches the method of claim 1, wherein an algorithm of the externalized inferencing component for performing the evaluation is shared by a plurality of externalized inferencing components (see pp. 26-27, §Situational Trigger Point - an example, code fragment, *Examiner interprets class "TriggerPoint" to be an externalized inferencing component for performing the evaluation which can be*

shared by a plurality of externalized inferencing components by simply creating an instance, *"TriggerPoint tp"*, and then calling the instance, as in *"result = tp.triggerSituational(this,...)"*, to perform an evaluation.).

Regarding claim 20. (Previously Presented) *IBM* teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising providing an inference component management facility to administer externalized inferencing components, the administration including operations to create, retrieve, update, and delete (see p. 18, BRBeans Rule Management Application, "The BRBeans Rule Management Application is implemented as a Java Application that runs stand-alone, remotely or locally to the BRBeans rule server. It is used to create, update, expire, and delete BRBeans Rules, and can also be used to interactively import and export BRBeans Rules from/to XML.", Examiner interprets the "BRBeans Rule Management Application" to provide an inference component management facility to administer externalized inferencing components, the administration including operations to create, retrieve, update, and delete.).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed February 19, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3-10, 13, 16-18, 20 and 36 Under 35

U.S.C. §101

Applicants argue:

Claims 1, 3-10, 13, 16-18, 20 and 36 have been rejected under 35 USC 101, as failing to be directed to a practical application and in addition for violating the doctrine of preemption.

Claims 1 and 36 claim, inter alia, "passing the parameters to an externalized inferencing component upon executing a trigger point in the program of instructions; evaluating, by the externalized inferencing component, the data comprising a set of rules to be interpreted against the parameters to perform an inference external to the program of instructions, wherein the externalized inferencing component is in communication with the program of instructions, wherein the inference is a derivation of the knowledge; storing the knowledge derived by the inference with the data; and outputting the knowledge derived by the inference to trigger point of the program of instructions."

Such an application of an externalized inferencing component evaluating parameters passed by a trigger point to perform an inference is believed to be a practical application of a method (embodied in a computer readable medium (see Claim 1) and a system for executing a program of instructions in communication with an externalized inference component (see Claim 36)). Consider that in *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 209 USPQ 1 (1981), the Court noted, "when [a claimed invention] is performing a function which the patent laws were designed to protect (e.g., transforming or reducing an article to a different state or thing), then the claim satisfies the requirements of

Art Unit: 2129

Section 101." Diehr, 450 U.S. at 192. In Claims 1 and 36, the claimed a computer processes perform inferencing external to a program of instructions, passing parameters by a trigger point for evaluation by an externalized inferencing component to perform the inferencing (external to the program of instruction). Thus, the claimed process is believed to be statutory as being limited to a practical application in the technological arts of computer programming.

Therefore, Claims 1 and 36 are believed to be directed towards statutory subject matter.

Examiner's response:

Examiner disagrees. The applicant argues "Such an application of an externalized inferencing component evaluating parameters passed by a trigger point to perform an inference is believed to be a practical application." What is the practical application?

Performing inference external to some "program of instructions" is no more than calling some external procedure with arguments or parameters. That the external procedure performs "inferencing" does not place its operation outside the control framework of any other type of performing code (e.g., a numerical simulation). Both the external procedure and the program of instructions that calls the external procedure run under the control of some application sever or, minimally, under some operating system running internally to some computer. Neither

Art Unit: 2129

process is or performs a tangible transformation of real-world entities. As defined on pages 3-4 of the Specification, the inferencing components and their organization constitute a set of mathematical abstractions of data structure and control flow. Pages 6-7 of the Specification provide further formalisms "for orchestrating application behavior":

The general idea is to replace logic normally embedded within applications by trigger points that in turn appeal to external authorities to perform the desired processing. The variability of applications so engineered can then be easily and dynamically manipulated without altering the rule-driven applications themselves. The placement of trigger points at various layers of an application enables corresponding levels of rules abstraction. Centralization of the externalizable logic and data advances the possibilities for understandability, consistency, reuse, and manageability while coincidentally reducing the maintenance costs of the sundry applications employing trigger points and rules across an enterprise.

Indeed, the practical results of: "understandability, consistency, reuse, manageability" and "reducing the maintenance costs of the sundry applications" are advanced as possibilities or are simply *coincidental* to the process of abstraction comprising the externalization of logic. Examiner interprets this to mean Applicant's invention is

Art Unit: 2129

not directed toward a practical application and is not considered to be statutory under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Applicants argue:

Turning now to the suggestion that the claims violated the doctrine of preemption: that is whether the claim would, in reality, preempt the use of a law of nature or abstract idea. While one may not patent a process that comprises every substantial practical application of an abstract idea, because such a patent in practical effect would be a patent on the abstract idea itself, the claims are clearly presented in terms of a computer readable medium (see Claim 1) and a system for executing a program of instructions in communication with an externalized inference component (see Claim 36). Accordingly, the claims are not directed to mere abstract ideas but include limitations that are both concrete and tangible. Consider the method step of "evaluating, by the externalized inferencing component, the data comprising a set of rules to be interpreted against the parameters to perform an inference external to the program of instructions, wherein the externalized inferencing component is in communication with the program of instructions, wherein the inference is a derivation of the knowledge" (emphasis added), which comprises substantial limitations outside the realm of mere abstraction such as a mathematical formula without a practical application. While such a limitation may cover a board range of computer readable mediums and systems for executing a program of instructions, the claims clearly rise above the level of an abstract idea.

Examiner responds:

Examiner disagrees.

The courts have also held that a claim may not preempt ideas, laws of nature or natural phenomena. The concern over preemption was expressed as early as 1852. See Le Roy v. Tatham, 55 U.S. (14 How.) 156, 175 (1852) ("A principle, in the abstract, is a

fundamental truth; an original cause; a motive; these cannot be patented, as no one can claim in either of them an exclusive right."); Funk Bros. Seed Co. v. Kalo Inoculant Co., 333 U.S. 127, 132, 76 USPQ 280, 282 (1948).

Accordingly, one may not patent every "substantial practical application" of an idea, law of nature or natural phenomena because such a patent "in practical effect would be a patent on the [idea, law of nature or natural phenomena] itself." "Here the "process" claim is so abstract and sweeping as to cover both known and unknown uses of the BCD to pure-binary conversion. The end use may (1) vary from the operation of a train to verification of drivers' licenses to researching the law books for precedents and (2) be performed through any existing machinery or future-devised machinery or without any apparatus." Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 71-72, 175 USPQ 673, 676 (1972).

The Courts have found that subject matter that is not a practical application or use of an idea, a law of nature or a natural phenomenon is not patentable. As the Supreme Court has made clear, "[a]n idea of itself is not patentable," Rubber-Tip Pencil Co. v. Howard, 20 U.S. (1 Wall.) 498, 507 (1874); taking several abstract ideas and manipulating them together adds nothing to the basic equation. In re Warmerdam, 31 USPQ2d 1754 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

First, computer readable media are not considered to be the object of Applicant's invention. Rather, Applicant's invention is directed toward techniques of restructuring

'control flow' within computer programs using a programming abstraction called a "trigger point" :

The general idea is to replace logic normally embedded within applications by trigger points that in turn appeal to external authorities to perform the desired processing. The variability of applications so engineered can then be easily and dynamically manipulated without altering the rule-driven applications themselves. The placement of trigger points at various layers of an application enables corresponding levels of rules abstraction. (see Specification, p. 7)

Second, the final result of amended independent claims 1 and 36 is the derivation and storage of knowledge per se which Examiner considers abstract. Applicants do not limit knowledge to any particular domain nor do they limit 'inference' to any particular type (e.g., deontic logic (see [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deontic logic](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deontic_logic))). Thus, the externalization technique disclosed can be applied to any type of knowledge using any type of reasoning. Examiner considers this to clearly cover every substantial practical application of the abstract idea of externalization of inferencing. Examiner maintains rejection of claims 1 and 36 under 35 USC 101. Claims 3-10, 13, 16-18, 20 provide the technical details of the externalization technique, which does not cure the deficiency of claim 1. Therefore, claims 1, 3-10, 13, 16-

Art Unit: 2129

18, 20 and 36 are considered non-statutory under 35 USC 101.

Rejection of Claims 1-33 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(a)

Applicants argue:

The externalized business rules of IBM are not analogous to externalized inferencing components as claimed in Claim 1. For example, one could write an externalized business rule as described in IBM, however, IBM does not teach how to cause the externalized business rule to do inferencing. The externalized business rules of IBM are used for making classifications and do not include inference components - for example, the derivation rule (page 3 of IBM) simply returns a "value." IBM does not teach that the value is new knowledge. The claimed inferencing derives new knowledge from rules and knowledge (data and parameters). IBM simply does not teach inferencing. More particularly, the RuleImplementor does not evaluate "data comprising a set of rules to be interpreted against the parameters to perform an inference external to the program of instructions" essentially as claimed in Claim 1.

Examiner responds:

Examiner disagrees. The externalized business rules of IBM are analogous to externalized inferencing components as claimed in Claim 1. IBM teaches how to cause the externalized business rule to do inferencing in the Trigger Point code examples on pages 25-27 and the description of Runtime behavior on pages 32-33. IBM clearly states that

externalized business rules can "return any type of value that makes sense in a business context" (see IBM, §Derivation rule, p.3). The question is what sort of things a "value" can take or hold or point to. IBM at p. 21, §Returning results from rules, specifies that "the return type on the fire method is java.lang.Object" which is the superclass of all Java objects and not simply a "value." Clearly, any object definable in Java can be result from rule firing (e.g., Jess objects (see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jess_programming_language and <http://www.jessrules.com/>)). Examiner considers the Classifier Trigger Point (see IBM, p. 25) to teach that the value is new knowledge. Clearly, determining "what sort of business situation is present" at some instant of time is new knowledge, since every instant of time is non-recurring. Examiner considers dependent rules to teach that inferencing derives new knowledge (especially when used to classify situations) from rules and knowledge (data and parameters) (see IBM, §Dependent Rules, p. 21). Thus IBM does teach inferencing, essentially as claimed in Claim 1.

Art Unit: 2129

Applicants argue:

Turning to the operation of IBM's IF/THEN statement; the IF/THEN statement of IBM is a conditional statement used in only classification and lacks inherent inferencing capabilities. The IF/THEN statement, on its own, lacks the complexity for deriving knowledge. The IF/THEN statement is merely a logical argument that cannot be considered an inference as it, by itself, does not derive knowledge.

Examiner responds:

First, consider Applicants' description of the application of IF/THEN (conditional) reasoning in the claimed invention. Applicants recognize that inference rules are typically IF/THEN rules:

...inference rules are typically statements of the form "if condition is 'condition x' then result is 'result x'". "Rule:1 (a)" represents "if condition is 'condition a' then result is 'result a'". Similarly, "Rule:2 (b)" represents "if condition is 'condition b' then result is 'result b'". (see Specification, p. 22)

Then, Applicants statically and dynamically form IF/THEN rules:

A composition, such as EIC 740, can occur statically (prior to runtime) or dynamically (at runtime). "Rule:3 (c0)" represents "if condition is 'condition c0' then result is 'result c0'". Similarly, "Rule:4 (d1)" represents "if condition is 'condition d1' then result is 'result d1'".

More concretely, "Rule:3 (c)" might represent "if customer status 'c' then give customer discount 'c'"; "c->c0" might represent "substitute 'condition: bronze, result: 10 percent' for 'c'"; the combination results in: if customer has status 'bronze' then give

Art Unit: 2129

customer discount '10 percent'. (see Specification, p. 26)

See also page 27 of the Specification. Clearly Applicants apply IF/THEN constructs as representations of inference rules. Now, consider a simple definition of logical implication:

For the sake of clarity and simplicity in the present introduction, it is convenient to use the two-sign notation, but allow the sign " \rightarrow " to denote the boolean function that is associated with the truth table of the material conditional. These considerations result in the following scheme of notation.

$p \rightarrow q$	$p \Rightarrow q$
if p then q	p implies q

(see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Logical_implication)

Clearly, a conditional statement may be considered to be a type of logical implication or inference.

Applicants argue:

Further, IBM fails to teach that an output of the RuleImplementor may be added to data; IBM does not teach "storing the knowledge derived by the inference with the data" as claimed in Claim 1.

Examiner responds:

IBM does teach that an output of the RuleImplementor may be added to data. First, the RuleImplementor is an interface class the performs common functions for instances of the

class BRBeans Rule. Now, the attributes of the BRBeans Rule EJB are stored within a database table (see IBM, \$Database considerations, p. 6). Examiner interprets the runtime behavior of RuleImplementor to imply that when an instance of RuleImplementor,

6. ... maxRuleImpl returns a ConstraintReturn object to the Rule indicating the result of its comparison. This ConstraintReturn is returned to the trigger point framework...(see IBM, \$Runtime behavior, p. 33)

to mean the ConstraintReturn object is returned to and stored in a userDefinedData field in a database table (see IBM, \$Database considerations, p. 6).

IBM does teach "storing the knowledge derived by the inference with the data" where knowledge, as rules, are stored in a "database table". Examiner interprets the "WebSphere application server in which the BRBeans EJBs are installed" to comprise relational databases in which all rule classes, entity classes, and trigger point classes are implemented in relational database tables. Thus knowledge derived (e.g., business situation knowledge) is necessarily stored in the database along with the data giving rise to the situational inference (see \$The BRBeans framework - overview, BRBeans EJBs, p. 18 and \$Runtime behavior, p. 32-33).

Art Unit: 2129

Applicants argue:

Claims 3-10, 13, 16-18 and 20 depend from Claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1. Claims 2, 11-12, 14-15, 19 and 21-33 have been cancelled. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 36 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1.

Examiner responds:

Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 1 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a). Claim 1 is not allowable and therefore, the dependent claims 3-10, 13, 16-18 and 20 are not allowable.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan H. Brown, Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272- 8632. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 0830-1700. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Vincent can be reached on 571-272-3080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2129

Nathan H. Brown, Jr.

May 22, 2008

/David R Vincent/
Supervisory Patent
Examiner, Art Unit 2129